



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING
COMMITTEE ON
LAW AND NATIONAL
SECURITY

INTELLIGENCE REPORT

Vol. 3, No. 4

Morris I. Leibman, Chairman

April 1981

Standing Committee News

Morris I. Leibman, Chairman of the Standing Committee, is back in Chicago following his long illness. He expresses deep gratitude to all who sent their prayers and encouragement over the past months.

Congressional Activities Affecting Intelligence

The Senate and House Intelligence Committees spent most of the month of March in executive session. Congressman Edwards (D-Cal.) introduced H.R. 2589 on March 18 to amend 18 USC to prohibit certain disclosures relating to intelligence personnel; the bill was referred jointly to the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees.

On April 7 and 8, the House Intelligence Committee held hearings on H.R. 4, the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1981. (See March *Intelligence Report*.) Witnesses included Jim Wright (D-Tex.), Majority Whip; Bob Michel (R-Ill.), Minority Whip; William J. Casey, Director, CIA; Richard Williard, Counsel for Intelligence, Office of Intelligence, Law and Policy, DOJ; Jerry Berman and Morton Halpern, American Civil Liberties Union; Kenneth Bass; John Warner, Association of Former Intelligence Agents; Robert Lewis, Society of Professional Journalists; Philip Heymann, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School; Antonin Scalia, Professor of Law, Stanford Law School; and Floyd Abrams, Esq., New York. Excerpts from these hearings will be reported in the May newsletter.

The Communist Propaganda Apparatus and Other Threats to the Media

Excerpts from a statement by Sir James Goldsmith to the Media Committee of the Conservative Party at the House of Commons on January 21, 1981.

INSIDE

A Geopolitical Overview p.5

Covert Action Colloquium p.7

Most European countries have Communist parties which account for between 15% and 20% of the national vote. It has been considered fortunate that, in Britain, the Communist Party has never gained significant electoral support. But the consequences of this lack of democratic appeal have been far reaching.

The Cabinet papers for 1950 were released this month. They reveal that as early as 1950 the Attlee Cabinet understood and stated clearly that as a result of the lack of electoral support, the Communist Party in Britain had changed its strategy from trying to obtain Parliamentary representation to infiltrating the key centres of national power.

The infiltration into the key trade unions, into the Labour Party organisation and into the Parliamentary Labour Party is now so well documented that even the moderates have to admit to seeing it. In the name of democracy the Communists and their allies have established rotten boroughs which they now own.

As I am addressing the Media Committee, the bulk of my remarks will concern the Press, the media and the Communist propaganda effort both internationally and in the UK.

The leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) regards propaganda as an indispensable adjunct to Soviet foreign policy and military strategy. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the US House of Representatives heard evidence to the fact that the investment by the Soviets in propaganda is between \$3 and \$4 billion per annum. In addition to this there are the investments made by those countries which the CPSU use as a secondary instrument in their propaganda effort and more particularly the European satellite countries, Libya and Cuba. In charge of the propaganda apparatus is the International Information Department (IID) which was founded in Moscow in March 1968. The IID is headed by Leonid Zamyatin, former Director of the Soviet news agency Tass. The First Deputy Chief of the IID is Valentin Falin, the former Soviet Ambassador to West Germany. Mr. Zamyatin reports to Boris Ponomarev, who is an Alternative Member of the Politburo. The KGB provides an unattributable adjunct to the overt Soviet propaganda network. It is called Service A and is part of the KGB's

Editor: Florence D. Bank, Standing Committee on Law and National Security, ABA, 1155 East 60 Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Copyright © 1981 American Bar Association

First Chief Directorate. Service A plans, coordinates and supports operations which are designed to back-up overt Soviet propaganda and uses such devices as planted Press articles, planted rumours, disinformation and controlled information to the media. In the early 1970s, this section of the KGB was upgraded from Department to Service status. Service A maintains liaison with its counterparts in the Cuban and East European services and coordinates its overall programme with theirs.

The purpose of this propaganda organisation is to discredit or to promote, according to the needs of Soviet strategy, ideas, plans, countries and individuals.

Their principal tools of trade are front organisations, the media, individual journalists and agents of influence. Each of these categories falls within two broad classifications: those that can be linked to the Communist Party and those which are covert and are apparently objective conduits of information. The latter are particularly useful because of their enhanced credibility.

An analysis of the principal front organisations illustrates the breadth of the propaganda effort. One of the major organisations is the "World Peace Council" (WPC). It originated in 1950 from the "World Congress of Intellectuals for Peace". The WPC owns a number of publications which are published in English, French, Spanish and German. It also issues a large number of bulletins, booklets and specific regional issues. Its principal propaganda objective is to encourage the West to disarm. The WPC conducts its operations on a worldwide basis and it has spawned regional and national peace committees. The WPC sponsors meetings, including such congresses as the "World Forum of Peace Forces", the "World Committee for Religious Leaders for Lasting Peace, Disarmament and Just Relations between People", etc., etc.

The "World Federation of Trade Unions" (WFTU) is another Communist front. It also publishes magazines, pamphlets, etc. Its objective is described as the comprehensive support and defence of the world socialist system and it orchestrates campaigns against multinational companies and in favour of union power. It has been granted Category A status by the United Nations along with UNESCO and the Food and Agricultural Organisation.

The "World Federation of Democratic Youth" (WFDY) and the "International Union of Students" has the task of subverting youth. It is estimated that it has spent up to \$100 million in organising youth festivals.

The "International Organisation of Journalists" (IOJ) has as an avowed aim the defence "of freedom of the Press and journalists" and the "defence of all journalists to write according to their conscience and convictions." An official US Government report shows that the IOJ has engaged itself in a systematic campaign to discredit independent international news agencies and non-Communist newspapers. A major activity of the IOJ is the training of journalists in the IOJ's main schools which are located in Budapest, East Berlin, Prague and Sofia and

further schools are planned in Havana and Algiers.

The "International Institute for Peace" (IIP) claims to provide a forum where scientists throughout the world can discuss peace problems. It also publishes journals in English and German.

The "Christian Peace Conference" (CPC) claims to be a "forum at which Christians from all over the world will meet together and search for God's will concerning current political, social and economic problems."

The "Women's International Democratic Federation" (WIDF) has as avowed goals "to unite women regardless of race, nationality, religion or political opinions so that they may win and defend their rights as citizens, mothers and workers and ensure peace, democracy and national independence.

The "International Association of Democratic Lawyers" announced its aims at its 30th anniversary meeting held at the UNESCO building in Paris. They were "to put the law at the service of men, democracy, freedom and a new international economic order."

Other major Communist fronts are the "International Radio and Television Organisation" (ORIT), the "World Federation of Scientific Workers" (WFSW) and the "International Federation of Resistance Fighters" (IFRF).

Each of these organisations has sponsored sub-organisations at international, national and local level and publishes magazines, bulletins, etc. Each of these organisations can be shown to be a Communist front with links to Moscow.

In the same way as the International Information Department (IID) is the overt centre of Soviet propaganda whereas Service A is the supporting organisation, so there is another layer of front organisations which are apparently independent but which in fact are channels for Soviet propaganda. There are many of them and they use the words, "peace", "freedom" and "human rights" so often that for any reasonably attentive observer the noble meaning of these words has been raped and debased.

The use of the media and of journalists follows a similar pattern. There are many hundreds of publications under Communist control. There are many hundreds of magazines and bulletins published by the front organisations. And there is the use of apparently objective media. This is achieved either by subsidising them or by penetrating them with journalists who are sympathetic to Communist propaganda. Mr. Ladislav Bittman, former Deputy Chief of the disinformation department of the Czechoslovak Intelligence Service, defected to the United States. In his debriefing he said: "A relatively high percentage of secret agents are journalists. A journalist operating in Great Britain, West Germany or the United States is a great asset to the Communist intelligence. He can be investigative, professionally curious, it is his job to get important and even highly-sensitive information... These individuals are bought or blackmailed." He went on to say: "There are many journalists who are agents. There are important newspapers around the world pene-

trated by Communist intelligence services. There are one or two journalists working for a particular paper and who are agents and who receive from time to time instructions to publish this story or that story... There are newspapers in the West which are owned by Communist intelligence service... There are publishing houses owned by Communist intelligence service... There are publishing houses owned by Communist intelligence services."

General Sejna, the high-ranking Czech intelligence defector, admitted that the campaign by the German news magazine *Der Spiegel* to discredit Franz Joseph Strauss was orchestrated by the KGB. In France, the journalist, Pierre Charles Pathe, was convicted of receiving payments from the KGB and acting as a KGB agent in the French media. Another well-documented example quoted by the Deputy Director of Operations of the CIA is of a West European journalist arrested in 1979. He was recruited by a Soviet employee of the United Nations and turned over to a KGB officer in the cultural section of the Soviet Embassy in his country of residence. He was bought, and he wrote articles from 1960 to 1979 based on information handed to him by the Soviets and that were published either in his own newspaper or passed on to other journalists.

The use of what Soviets call "agents of influence" is also well documented. Ladislav Bittman testified about people who occupied important positions in governments, military establishments or the scientific elite. Academicians are a prime target. Andrei Sacharov, the Nobel Prize winner, smuggled out of Russia what he called his testament to the West. In it he wrote: "People in the West have been bought by Soviet agencies in the most direct sense of the word... These include some political figures, businessmen, and a great many writers and journalists, government advisers and heads of the Press and TV."

I will describe in some detail one of the many examples of a Communist propaganda campaign. This was the Soviet desire to weaken Western defence, to encourage unilateral disarmament, particularly in Europe and thereby to be able to isolate and Finlandize each European country. In other words, to create a public mood against taking the measures necessary to be able to defend ourselves. To this end the Soviets launched a major propaganda effort against the neutron bomb.

It is officially estimated that this specific campaign cost \$100 million. It was part of the Soviet general campaign aimed at preventing NATO from modernising its Theatre Nuclear Forces (TNF). There was also a special attack on the Cruise missile. It was launched by Mr. Daniel Proecktor, head of the European Securities Section of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations.

The campaign was then taken up by the World Peace Council who declared the 6th to the 13th August, 1977, as an international "week of action". It then became a co-ordinated effort of the whole propaganda apparatus including the use of agitprop. The sequence of events was:

—Peace councils in various East European states held protest meetings.

—In Istanbul, a peace committee demonstrated in front of the US Consulate General.

—In Accra, a group delivered a protest letter to the US Embassy.

—In Stuttgart, Frankfurt and Dusseldorf, front groups organised demonstrations in front of the US Consulate Generals.

—Similar agitation was carried out by front groups in Lima and Tanzania, as well as a Peruvian protest to the United Nations.

—Other major international fronts such as the "World Federation of Trade Unions" participated in the international week of action.

Also there were the series of Communist-planned conferences in Europe. The target of this effort was the United Nations "Special Session on Disarmament" (SSOD) to be held in New York from 23rd May to 28th June. Three conferences were organised to provide psychological momentum to the SSOD. The World Peace Council, through one of its sub-fronts, the "International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces", organised a symposium from the 6th to 8th February in Vienna on "Nuclear Energy and the Arms Race" in collaboration with the International Atomic Energy Agency, a United Nations body. A larger meeting was staged in Geneva from 22nd February to 2nd March under the group calling itself the "Special Non-Government Organisations Committee on Disarmament." In fact the real organiser was the World Peace Council aided by the Swiss peace movement. Then there was the "International Forum on the Neutron Bomb" held from the 18th to 20th March in Amsterdam. Sympathisers from all over Europe were brought in for the meeting which culminated on 19th March in a demonstration by some 40,000 people. There were many other meetings used for the same purpose and organised by the World Peace Council, including one in Mexico City from the 1st to 4th February and another from the 9th to 12th February in Athens.

All this activity was picked up in the Western European media. The Committee on Intelligence in the US House of Representatives heard evidence that "a segment of this Press could be counted on to react almost automatically once the neutron bomb received this enormous attention". The evidence continues as follows: "For the Soviets the real propaganda success lay in the broad adverse treatment given to the neutron bomb by the so-called independent Press." NATO Secretary-General Luns described this Press comment as all consisting of "half truths, untruths and ignorance."

On 4th April it was announced that President Carter had decided to delay the production and deployment of the neutron bomb.

The chief of the International Department of the Hungarian Communist Party, Janos Berecz, wrote that the "political campaign against the neutron bomb was

one of the most significant and successful since World War II..."

There are innumerable examples of puzzling reporting by the British media. This does not necessarily mean that those directly responsible are Soviet agents. It can mean that they are innocent casualties of a propaganda campaign.

It is important to understand how such campaigns gather momentum. When a journalist is working on an article, he calls for those Press cuttings files which refer to the subject about which he is writing. Information included in these files, particularly when it has been published in reputable publications and has not been corrected, will be used over and over again. So, once the Press cuttings files have been polluted by propaganda, the false information will be repeated quite innocently and as it is repeated will gather further credibility and momentum. Responsible journalists go to great lengths to check a statement in cuttings, but, inevitably, even they sometimes fall into the trap....

An attempt has been made in Britain to create a body whose job it is to maintain the highest standards in the British Press. That body is known as the Press Council.

In the past I have asked the Press Council to declare its principles on the following questions:

- Disclosure by journalists of payments and other inducements received, inter alia, from foreign countries.
- Disclosure by publications of their sources of finance.
- Disclosure by journalists of conflict of interest.

The Council answered that they wished "to deal with specific instances where it is alleged the Press has failed to meet the standards it should." In other words, the Press Council wishes to deal with particularities and not to establish general principles and standards. This is despite the fact that the Royal Commission on the Press (1977) recommended in its final report "that the Press Council should draw up a code of behaviour on which to base its adjudications." In other words, to establish general principles and standards.

But the behaviour of the Press Council is even more open to controversy. The chairman of the Press Council is Mr. Patrick Neill, QC. Last year, the Press Council, under Mr. Neill's chairmanship, was called upon to adjudicate on a complaint concerning an employee of the World in Action programme of Granada TV. Contemporaneously, Mr. Patrick Neill was employed as a barrister by Granada TV (also the World in Action programme). I wrote to Mr. Neill and asked him whether he felt it proper that at one and the same time as he was supposed to act as a judge, he should have received a fee from the employer of one of the parties over whom he was purporting to pass independent judgment. His answer indicated that he perceived no conflict of interest....

It is interesting to note that the Royal Commission on the Press suggested that the Press Council sometimes speaks in the "language of partisanship which inevitably weakens confidence in the impartiality of the Press

Council."

In view of the Press Council's letter to me stating its reticence at getting involved in general principles I was surprised to read only a few weeks ago that they have now called for a Freedom of Information Act which would make information held by the government available to the public as a legal right. This sounds like the sort of proposal put forward in the USA which led, in that country, to the Freedom of Information Act and to the Privacy Act. The USA has now had experience of the effects of these acts. They are accepted as amounting to a charter of rights for the KGB and terrorist organisations. They were promoted and are being defended by a number of independent institutions which are apparently objective but who nonetheless consistently support views similar to those disseminated by Communist front organizations....

Not long ago, there was an official hearing in Washington on the effects of the Freedom of Information Act. The testimony showed that the Freedom of Information Act had severely damaged the intelligence-gathering capacity of the USA and that it had been helpful to the KGB and subversive organisations.... During 1978 this one government agency spent 116 man years working on requests for information, a significant proportion of which seems to have emanated from sources inimicable to the United States.

Fortunately President Ronald Reagan is known to want to restore the operational capacity of the CIA and his team realises that as a first step the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act have to be repealed or substantially amended.

How is it that, contrary to its principle of dealing only with specific points, the Press Council should make such a proposal? Is the Council just plain foolish or is it sinister?

Parliament can no longer duck these issues. It must legislate to establish standards and these standards must include:

1. That the membership of the Press Council be truly independent and responsible.
2. That a law be enacted similar to the American Foreign Agents Regulations Act which would make it necessary for all journalists or anyone else receiving payments and inducements from a foreign government to register as an agent of that country.
3. That as far as is practicable, the media and those who are involved with it should disclose the sources of their funds.

Recently we have seen great companies paralysed by strikes at the very time that they are struggling for their survival. Often these strikes are caused by a handful of men over seemingly trivial issues. And we hear the usual comment: "They must be mad, they must want to commit suicide." What a ridiculous statement. These small groups do not want to commit suicide. They want to create unemployment. They want to create chaos. They want to create civil strife. Because only in this way can

they bring about the structural changes that they seek.

Those who are committing suicide are the thousands who follow blindly. Like the rest of us, they have watched this nation being destroyed by a small minority. We have been too cowardly to fight back. Some have refused to face facts and have preferred to giggle their way into oblivion. Some have found it comfortable to preach tolerance. Some have preferred to avoid the problem and to emigrate—over four million during the past fifteen years. Some have been just plain apathetic. But all are guilty. Guilty of treason by default.

“A Geopolitical Overview”

*Excerpts from Luncheon Address, January 14, 1981,
By Frank Barnett, Director, National Strategy
Information Center, at “Doing Business in a
Dangerous World” Seminar*

... I want to say right at the beginning that the threat to world stability stems not only from Soviet war ships and Cuban entry or from uncontrollable populations in terms of stability. It arises from a working system which the U.S. has tended to ignore—the Nazis believed in it profoundly and the KGB believes in it—covert action and political warfare operations. The United States needs to revitalize our freshly disabled CIA and, with its allies, vigorously reenter the world of trans-national politics. I would rather call it that than call it covert operations because many forms of so called covert operations are non-violent and really as routine and benign as providing funds to politicians and liberal leaders who oppose Communist takeovers in their own countries. It is a curious form of morality that would forbid the west to assist the third world in those political bounds. I think all of us could study properly what the West German Social Democrats did to save Portugal. And that might be termed benign trans-national politics. I think also that what the Council on the Americas, the American Institute of Free Labor Development in Latin America, the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Europe, and the AFL-CIO did to form free trade unions, in the decade right after World War II, indicates that there is a constructive and perfectly permissible role for private institutions. I hope to direct your attention to this underlying geopolitical or geoeconomic risk that some of us think endangers the economic health and indeed national security of all the industrial democracies. The short term for that is the resource war.

Mr. Harry Gray, Chairman of the United Technologies Corporation, has predicted that U.S. industry will shortly be faced with new type OPECs in certain metals and in a major speech, to the American Society for Metals, he made these points: the U.S. together with Japan and Europe are becoming “have not” nations not only with respect to oil, but with respect to certain critical metals, and from 1950 to the present our raw materials situation has deteriorated drastically. We are frighten-

ingly vulnerable to overseas producers for certain critical metals; we are nearly 100 percent dependent on imports and our primary sources for those imports are unfriendly or unstable. Now Mr. Gray is by no means alone in voicing concern over the growing raw materials threat to the health of the free market countries. Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany speaks of the coming struggle for the world product. American business journalists, *Fortune*, *Forbes*, and so forth are starting to say that the U.S. and its allies may be on a collision course with the Soviet Union over access to strategic minerals. Two months ago in Paris, leading French businessmen invited their counterparts from Germany, the U.S. and Japan to a conference in their city to consider what could be done about the encirclement of African minerals and Mideast oil by the Soviet Union and its proxies. Here at home, major corporations are setting up in-house task forces to assess the economic impact of possible loss of access to overseas mineral supplies. President-Elect Reagan in September appointed a task force on strategic minerals which has reported to him and which emphasizes the urgency of this problem.

Now let me give you the reasons why I am pessimistic. It is true that one can point to things that worked out better than they should have or better than people thought they would, but if we go back over a quarter of a century, it seems to me we are confronted with a paradox—the paradox is that the Cold War was actually an era of serenity and safety for America and her allies. The reason was that America's overwhelming superiority in strategic weapons and naval power meant that three quarters of the world was effectively off limits to Soviet ambition. Today, after a decade, the USSR has designed a clear capability to move from Stalin's precept which was defense of homeland, to Admiral Gorshkov's which is projection of its power overseas to all continents. And it is this global reach of Russia's conventional weapons which is the striking new factor in geopolitics...

Roughly three-quarters of the world's estimated reserves of oil in the Persian Gulf are now largely encircled by Soviet proxies, and Russian officers together with Cuban infantry and East German security police are remarkable by their presence in that theater. Southern Africa, from Zaire south, is, in effect, the Saudi Arabia of minerals. It has roughly one-quarter of the world's critical supply of chrome and cobalt in the platinum group. And that area too is increasingly threatened by proxies of the U.S.S.R. In effect, while we have been comforting ourselves with the rhetoric of detente, the Soviet Union has set up military sub-systems on four continents. And those circuits give Moscow an option either to play high risk, low risk or almost invisible types of conflict...

From Moscow's point of view, a resource war is low cost, low casualty, low risk, low visibility. Again, from the point of view of Moscow, an undeclared resource war does not endanger the population centers nor harm the factories of the Russians. Indeed, for the most part, it

does not even interrupt the West-East flow of grain and technology. From that perspective, Angola was not simply a minor scuffle. Instead, it may have been the opening campaign of the resource war which has provided a base close to Zaire and the cobalt which we depend on so much.

Now it is possible to discount the economic warfare scenario as improbable in the modern context. But economic warfare waged by Moscow through minerals would not have to be conspicuously oriented in order to promote industrial chaos in the West. There would also be an added bonus for a Soviet minerals super cartel, in that Moscow's adversary, the People's Republic of China, also needs to import much of its chrome and nickel cobalt platinum. And thus, the Soviet resource war prompted primarily against the West will also be a means to delay China's modernization and delay the upgrading of PRC military forces on the Soviet flank which, according to most Soviet political military journals, must be one of their goals. I recognize that it is argued that a Soviet cartel to control non-fuel minerals could not succeed in the long run because individual African states would have to trade with the West to survive and that I think is true. But perhaps that reasoning fails to recognize that in the short run, states in Africa might be integrated and exploited by the Warsaw Pact even as the USSR has in the past exploited East Germany. The arrangement would not be very efficient, but it might serve to disrupt world trade and thus injure or even cripple portions of the West. The geographical distance of African states from Russia is no necessary impediment to Soviet economic warfare....

I want to propose a solution and it may strike you as a rather bizarre solution, but at least it is a solution... Let's talk about the wisdom of summoning for the southern hemisphere a new chain of naval alliances in an era of energy scarcity and mineral crises. Instead of succumbing to creeping fear of Moscow's war machine and the gap in strategic nuclear forces, one ought to start talking about the wisdom of structuring a consortium backed by the high technologies of America, Europe and Japan, the oil reserves of Saudi Arabia, the military skills of Turkey, Pakistan and Korea, and of course the power position of Britain, France and the U.S. The idea of collective security must again be summoned forth. It must be extended beyond the current boundaries of NATO. As you all know, the NATO Charter does not permit the collective military advance of NATO's mineral and energy flanks in Africa and the Persian Gulf. General DeGaulle, as early as 1958, argued that there should be a special arrangement to devise plans for the U.S. and Britain to operate collectively outside the boundaries of NATO. On these issues, General DeGaulle was rebuked. Well, today, there has been talk at certain international conferences of bringing Turkey, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia together with western states into a new version of CENTO. Some Europeans have been writing their generals about the need for European intervention to

assist the U.S. in the Persian Gulf. The Asian states are cautiously beginning to talk about military edge. Until very recently, they wanted to talk only about economic and social development. But the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia and the presence of the Soviet Pacific Fleet in Cam Ranh Bay have been a shock to some of our Asian friends. On their part, there is at least a cautious beginning of talk about a great degree of collective and extended security. And part of this has been animated by a growing appreciation of the resource dependency of the northern hemisphere on the southern hemisphere, where collective fleets would be very useful....

Looking ahead to the next 30 or 50 years, perhaps it's time to think about a new initiative of creating statesmanship on the scale of NATO and the Marshall Plan—a design large enough to bridge the 20th and 21st centuries—which might be summed up in the term tri-oceanic alliance, or if you like, a modern league of non-communist states that borders the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. At minimum, a tri-oceanic alliance should include such states as the U.S., Canada and Brazil; Britain, France, and West Germany; and Italy, Saudi Arabia and Turkey; and some may argue, Pakistan, Japan, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, Australia and New Zealand. While each of us can think of many other welcome candidates for such a grant alliance, including the other Latin American states and third world nations, there is a growing perception that Moscow is the seat of the new imperialism and that the western powers are no longer a danger. A tri-oceanic alliance might indeed be the over arching framework inside which both Israel and Egypt could find sufficient military and psychological security fully to consummate their own fragile truce. I think one should not also foreclose trying to find a formula by which a tri-oceanic alliance could serve as an incentive and a shield to encourage further positive and social progress in all of southern Africa. But, whatever the eventual shape of a tri-oceanic alliance, it should not stand in the way of trying to find an executive group of at least 10 or 12 states whose combined manpower, technology, geography and strategic resources would enable them to block Soviet gambits, to seal off Mideast oil, and to incorporate African and eventually even Latin American minerals and raw materials.

Well, no one imagines that non-communist governments are as yet ready to support such a new alliance, and therefore, practical men might say why bother even to discuss blueprints for a grand design admittedly so difficult to implement. My only answer is that man lives by political hope as well as invulnerable ICBMs. And to talk about the collective strengths of the non-communist world is to begin to offset the sort of despair, despondency and defeatism that I personally find not only in our country but even in Europe and in Asia. In other words, instead of focusing always on Soviet strength and the decline of free world esprit, it seems to me that one could remind the faint-hearted that a new tri-oceanic alliance

would compound awesome advantages for the free world. A tri-oceanic alliance would give us, for example, at least a four to one advantage over the Soviet Bloc in GNP, between 85 and 90 percent of the world scientific and engineering know-how, up to 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, nearly 85 percent of the world's food exports, and a three to one superiority in naval power in the Indian Ocean....

All analogies are fallacious but some at least inspire thought. I would like to argue that as NATO was the shield for the Marshall Plan and for the enormous American investment in Europe so a tri-oceanic alliance in the southern hemisphere would be the shield. It would justify the transfer of the tens of billions of dollars the third world countries have been asking us to put in those portions of the world. And thus, we would be helping others as we save ourselves. In conclusion, I can see that many say that a tri-oceanic alliance is either the impossible dream or the road to economic ruin as the cost of navies escalates. Again, my answer may not be very convincing. I can only say that in the early days of the Marshall Plan in 1949, to imagine that a prosperous econo-market and strong NATO could emerge from the rubble, ruin and almost total destruction of Europe was truly the impossible dream. But we're not talking about building a tri-oceanic alliance with impoverished and destroyed allies. We live in a world now in which there is the yen and the Saudi-Europe dollar, in which potential partners have technology almost as good as ours and currency that may even be stronger. And therefore, it's not quite as impossible as it might seem on the first hand. It's not a dream, but a coalition of democracies. A tri-oceanic alliance offers a sufficient magnitude to shift attention from Soviet success, Admiral Gorshkov's fleets of Cuban and East German-backed insurgency to free market strengths and to our capacity to invest enormous sums both in money and technology and in skilled manpower to aid the third world. Recall the wisdom of Winston Churchill who argued that to bring forth a new alliance may actually weigh more in the balance of history than to try to play a lonely battle by oneself.

Colloquium on Covert Action: Requirements for the 1980's

by David Martin

United States covert action requirements for the 1980's were subjected to a systematic examination in a colloquium conducted by the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, in Washington, D.C., on December 5-6, 1980. The proceedings will be published in the Fall.

In the opening session on the relationship between foreign policy and covert action, Dr. Adda Bozeman, Professor of International Relations at Sarah Lawrence College, stated that a basic purpose of Soviet covert action was to disorder our thought processes. She noted that the operational code established by Lenin stipulated

psychological and diplomatic attack campaigns against the capitalist West launched in the value language of the West in order to reach, confound, and eventually conquer the minds of peoples targeted for takeover. Our policy had been fatally flawed by the mechanistic tendency to apply to other countries, with complete different histories and cultures, American norms of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights.

The fact that 'democracy' with its Western connotations of parliamentary or congressional institutions, a multi-party system, elections, constitutional law and bills of rights, is basically alien to each of the non-Western realms, already so elaborately explicated in readily available accounts of Asian, Latin American, and African culture history, has apparently dropped from consciousness.

Dr. Angelo Codevilla, Professional Staff Member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, maintained that there was a natural and logical relationship between foreign policy and covert action. Secret means of exerting influence are part and parcel of foreign affairs, intrinsically no more and no less appropriate than other means. From time immemorial, nations have sought to influence the policies and conduct of other nations in a manner that serves their own national interests, working overtly through diplomacy and covertly through other means designed to win friends and influence the decision making process in the target nation.

Because the distinguishing feature of covert action is that the identity or motives of those promoting political changes be dissimulated, Dr. Codevilla argued that covert action depends primarily upon the availability of human beings who are well-enough placed to act, who are willing and able to act, and who maintain wholly or partly clandestine relations with the country on whose behalf they act. On the other hand, agents of influence are not necessarily 'moles'. They may be private citizens who can be induced by a variety of motives to perform politically significant activities from time to time.

Dr. Codevilla also maintained that democracies, despite their inherent limitations, also possess serious possibilities for influencing public opinion in the Communist countries, taking advantage of economic difficulties and of nationalist and religious differences.

Donald Jameson, formerly Covert Action Specialist, Soviet Division, CIA, presented a paper on "Trends in Soviet Covert Action." He said that the Soviet Union's origin as a covert action operation, its massive use of political warfare, which is perceived as necessary for survival, and the unlimited ambition of its leaders to expand their power, have led to the creation of a system in which covert action, propaganda and related activities play a role in state policy that is qualitatively different from their role in other societies. The principal KGB efforts in covert action focus on deception, penetration, misinformation, agents of influence, and manipulation of western media.

Jameson also made the point that not everybody

involved in Soviet inspired covert actions is a witting tool of the Soviets. The great majority of those who participated in the agitation against the Vietnam war in the United States were certainly not Communists or witting tools. But Soviet assistance and guidance played a crucial role in enhancing the scope and effect of the movement. Among other things, he maintained during this period the Soviets and their satellites trained and supported with equipment, money and safe havens a broad spectrum of the revolutionary, violence prone radicals in the United States.

Jameson predicted that over the coming decade Soviet covert operations will seek to achieve the following objectives: Enervate and confuse the U.S., divide Western Europe and dissolve NATO, and as a corollary, emphasize the national character of the European Communist Parties, reduce U.S. influence in the Middle East, promote disarmament in the West, divide China from the U.S., China from Japan and Japan from the U.S.

In his discussion of "The Uses of Political and Propaganda Covert Action in the 1980's", General Vernon A. Walters, former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, dealt with the damage done to our covert action capabilities in the post-Watergate period. Under the best of circumstances, he said, democratic governments resort to covert action reluctantly and with a feeling of guilt—unlike their totalitarian rivals to whom subterfuge and deception come instinctively.

Covert action, he said, cannot be turned on and off like a spigot. When the U.S. Congress placed so many strictures on such action, requiring it to be reported to committees of both Houses of Congress and then requiring the President to commit his responsibility to it in writing, for all practical purposes, they denied the U.S. this capability for a number of years. Many of the best practitioners either were retired or resigned in disgust at the opprobrium heaped upon them for, in effect, saving many U.S. lives that might have been lost on a hotter battlefield.

The Soviets, said Walters, sought consciously to exploit the guilt feelings to which Americans are so prone—guilt about their own wealth, about their treatment of the Blacks and the American Indians, and the Japanese-Americans in World War II. This proneness to guilt makes it possible to use a minimum of recruited agents and a maximum of discontented idealists.

While strongly urging the reestablishment of a covert action capability, Walters warned that covert action

should be used sparingly. Any government contemplating covert action should understand that this is a most serious decision. Only a decision to go to war is more serious. It should be used only in case the vital interests of the nation or its allies are at stake.

Walters pointed out that many of our friends and allies are under attack by covert action of various types. He warned that covert action capabilities, once destroyed, are not easily reconstructed, and, in the absence of such capabilities, the use of conventional or even nuclear forces might be the only assistance we could give.

But covert action requires special skills, special contacts and long-term experts who have won the confidence of those who must assist them in the country where the covert action is planned. So much of the success of such plans must be based on a degree of confidence that can only be built up over the years. Much of this confidence has been lost world-wide as a result of the frenzied attack on U.S. intelligence—not from abroad but from Americans who were well-intentioned but naive and without realization of the consequences of their actions.

Tracing the history of U.S. covert action since World War II, Hugh Tovar, former chief of the CIA's Covert Action Staff, pointed out that under President Truman, during the period 1946-51, major programs were developed in Europe aimed primarily at forestalling communist political expansion in the democracies of Western Europe. This commitment to rebuild Europe found expression in the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, paramilitary action in Greece, and covert support for our political friends. Together, they constituted an expression of a national commitment to rebuild, revitalize and sustain Europe.

In addition to the historic victory in the field of covert action in post-war Europe, there were also significant covert action victories in the Philippines in 1952-56.

Tovar argued that if covert action is to have any reasonable chance of succeeding, it must bear a coherent relationship to the main thrust of U.S. foreign policy.

Tovar outlined a whole series of measures that must be taken in order to recreate a covert action capability. Among other things, he recommended that the U.S. think big and purposefully about our goals and also about the suitability of the methods to be used in going after them; coordinate our thinking about whatever it is that we propose to do in the covert realm; and make certain that the American people understand the thrust and goals of our foreign policy.